

REMARKS

The Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed April 17, 2007. At the time of this Office Action, Claims 1-38 were pending in the Application and Claims 1-38 were rejected. The following actions were taken or matters raised: (I) Claims 1-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bradee et al. (US PUB No. 20020095571). In order to advance prosecution of this case by overcoming the rejections asserted by the Office, amendments and remarks addressing such rejection are presented herein. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Claims 1-38 Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Office has rejected independent Claims 1-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bradee (US PUB No. 20020095571). The Applicant asserts that, in view of amended Claims 1, 9, 20 and 28, the present invention as recited in amended Claims 1, 9, 20 and 28 and all Claims dependent thereon are clearly distinguished from Bradee and provides advantageous, useful and non-obvious functionality. Accordingly, the Applicant submits that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) applied to Claims 1-38 as being anticipated by Bradee is overcome and respectfully requests the Office to withdraw the rejection asserted against Claims 1-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bradee.

Claims 1 and 20 have been amended to characterize the invention with greater specificity in view of the Bradee. Claims 1 and 20 have each been amended to recite, "authorizing access to a computer system by a user in response to determining the user is a non-local user with

respect to the computer system, wherein said authorizing access includes successfully verifying that the user has an active shared directory account associated with the computer system; selecting a universal local user account of the computer system dependent upon said shared directory account, wherein the universal local user account has access privilege on the computer system; and mapping the user to the universal local user account, wherein said mapping enables access to the computer system in accordance with an access privilege level corresponding to the universal local user account.”

Claims 9 and 28 have been amended to characterize the invention with greater specificity in view of the Bradee. Claims 9 and 28 have each been amended to recite, “determining that a user of a computer system is a non-local status user with respect to the computer system; and associating the user with a universal local user account after said determining and after determining that the user has an active shared directory account associated with the computer system, wherein the universal local user account has access privilege on the computer system and wherein said associating enables access to the computer system in accordance with said access privilege corresponding to the universal local user account.”

With respect to Claims 1 and 20 of the Application, Bradee does not disclose or suggest the recited operations and associated limitations of such claims. More specifically, Brandee does not disclose i.) authorizing access to a computer system by a user in response to determining the user is a non-local user with respect to the computer system, ii.) authorizing access includes successfully verifying that the user has an active shared directory account associated with the computer system; iii.) selecting a universal local user account of the computer system dependent upon the shared directory account, or iv.) mapping the user to the universal

local user account wherein the mapping enables access to the computer system in accordance with an access privilege level corresponding to the universal local user account.

With respect to Claims 9 and 28 of the Application, Bradee does not disclose or suggest the recited operations and associated limitations of such claims. More specifically, Brandee does not disclose i.) determining that a user of a computer system is a non-local status user with respect to the computer system, or ii.) associating the user with a universal local user account after said determining and after determining that the user has an active shared directory account associated with the computer system wherein associating the user with the universal local user account enables access to the computer system in accordance with access privilege corresponding to the universal local user account.


Furthermore, Bradee teaches non-analogous art with respect to amended Claims 1, 9, 20 and 28. The user in Bradee is a local user with respect to a computer system running an application (Bradee [0039]). Also, the intent of Bradee is local authentication of a local user (Bradee [0038] – [0041]) whereas Claims 1 and 20 are directed to local authentication of a remote user. Thus, in contrast to the claimed invention of the present application, implementations in accordance with Bradee rely upon the user being local user and authentication being based on local account access information, local access rights and/or local access privileges as opposed to that of a remote user relying upon user account information associated one or more remote computer systems (i.e., a shared directory service manager) to access a non-local computer system.

In view of the amendments made to Claims 1, 9, 20 and 28 and the associated remarks, Claims 1, 9, 20 and 28, and all claims dependent thereon, are patentable under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Bradee because they recite features, physical structure and/or function not present in, configured for being provided by, or intended to be provided by system, equipment or methods in accordance with the disclosures of Bradee, and therefore distinguish physically over Bradee. Accordingly, the Applicant submits that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) applied to Claims 1-38 as being anticipated by Bradee is overcome and respectfully requests the Office to withdraw the rejection asserted against Claims 1-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bradee.

CONCLUSIONS

The Applicant has made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for reasons clearly apparent, the Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of all pending claims. If there are any matters that can be discussed by telephone to further the prosecution of the Application, the Applicant invites the Examiner to contact the undersigned at 512-306-8533 at the Examiner's convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Raymond M Galasso
Reg. No. 37,832

Galasso & Associates, LP
P.O. Box 26503
Austin, Texas 78755-0503
Telephone: (512) 306-8533
Facsimile: (512) 306-8559